Cosmology in generalized Horndeski theories with second-order equations of motion

Ryotaro Kase[1] and Shinji Tsujikawa[1]

[1]*Department of Physics, Faculty of Science, Tokyo University of Science, 1-3, Kagurazaka, Shinjuku, Tokyo 162-8601, Japan*

(Dated: September 1, 2014)

We study the cosmology of an extended version of Horndeski theories with second-order equations of motion on the flat Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) background. In addition to a dark energy field χ associated with the gravitational sector, we take into account multiple scalar fields ϕ_I $(I = 1, 2 \cdots, N-1)$ characterized by the Lagrangians $P^{(I)}(X_I)$ with $X_I = \partial_\mu \phi_I \partial^\mu \phi_I$. These additional scalar fields can model the perfect fluids of radiation and non-relativistic matter. We derive propagation speeds of scalar and tensor perturbations as well as conditions for the absence of ghosts. The theories beyond Horndeski induce non-trivial modifications to all the propagation speeds of N scalar fields, but the modifications to those for the matter fields ϕ_I are generally suppressed relative to that for the dark energy field χ. We apply our results to the covariantized Galileon with an Einstein-Hilbert term in which partial derivatives of the Minkowski Galileon are replaced by covariant derivatives. Unlike the covariant Galileon with second-order equations of motion in general space-time, the scalar propagation speed square c_{s1}^2 associated with the field χ becomes negative during the matter era for late-time tracking solutions, so the two Galileon theories can be clearly distinguished at the level of linear cosmological perturbations.

arXiv:1407.0794v2 [hep-th] 29 Aug 2014

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the most serious mysteries in modern cosmology is dark energy– the shadowy source for the late-time cosmic acceleration [1, 2]. The cosmological constant remains the most economical explanation for the origin of dark energy [3], but there are other alternatives such as scalar fields and modifications of Einstein gravity [4]. Interestingly, the recent combined analysis based on the observations of Supernovae type Ia (Sn Ia), Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB), and Baryon Acoustic Oscillations (BAO) showed that the cosmological constant is in mild tension with the data [5, 6].

Many dark energy models proposed in the literature involve at least one scalar degree of freedom. Typical examples are quintessence [7] and k-essence [8], in which the potential energy and the kinetic energy of a minimally coupled scalar field χ drives the cosmic acceleration. Even in the case of $f(R)$ gravity where the Lagrangian contains non-linear terms of the Ricci scalar R [9, 10], there exists a gravitational scalar degree of freedom coupled to non-relativistic matter [11].

If the derivatives higher than second order appear in the equations of motion, the corresponding theory is usually prone to a ghost-like (Ostrogradski) instability [12] related with the Hamiltonian unbounded from below. The Lagrangian of most general scalar-tensor theories with second-order equations of motion free from the Ostrogradski instability was first derived by Horndeski in 1973 [13]. The Horndeski theories accommodate a wide range of Lorentz-invariant dark energy models with one scalar degree of freedom–including quintessence [7], k-essence [8], $f(R)$ gravity [9, 10], Brans-Dicke theory [14], and Galileons [15, 16].

On the flat isotropic Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) background, it is also possible to provide a unified framework of modified gravitational theories based on the effective field theory (EFT) of cosmological perturbations [17]-[37]. The building block of this approach is a general action in unitary gauge that depends on the lapse function N and geometric scalar quantities (those from extrinsic and intrinsic curvatures) constructed in the 3+1 Arnowitt-Deser-Misner (ADM) formalism [38]. Expansion of the action up to quadratic order in perturbations shows that there exist spatial derivatives higher than second order in linear perturbation equations of motion, while time derivatives remain of second order. Gleyzes *et al.* [28] derived conditions for the absence of higher-order spatial derivatives, which are in fact satisfied for Horndeski theories.

The Horndeski Lagrangian contains four arbitrary functions $G_i(\chi, Y)$ $(i = 2, 3, 4, 5)$, where $Y = \partial_\mu \chi \partial^\mu \chi$ is the kinetic energy of a scalar field χ [39–41]. In unitary gauge this Lagrangian can be expressed in terms of three-dimensional ADM scalar quantities with four functions $A_i(t, N)$ $(i = 2, 3, 4, 5)$ and two functions $B_i(t, N)$ $(i = 4, 5)$, where the dependence of χ and Y in the functions G_i translate to that of time t and lapse N in A_i and B_i [28]. In Horndeski theories the functions B_4 and B_5 are related with A_4 and A_5 according to $A_4 = 2YB_{4Y} - B_4$ and $A_5 = -YB_{5Y}/3$, where $B_{iY} \equiv \partial B_i / \partial Y$ [35].

Even for the generalized version of Horndeski theories in which B_4 and B_5 are not necessarily related with A_4 and A_5, Gleyzes, Langlois, Piazza, and Vernizzi (GLPV) showed that, on the flat FLRW background, the perturbation equations of motion are of second order with one scalar propagating degree of freedom [35]. This second-order property

also holds for the odd-type perturbations on the spherically symmetric and static background [42]. In GLPV theories, the presence of symmetries in space-time allows for the absence of derivatives higher than quadratic order.

The covariantized version of the original Galileon [15]–whose Lagrangian is derived by replacing partial derivatives of the Minkowski Galileon [15] with covariant derivatives– belongs to a class of GLPV theories [35]. This is different from the covariant Galileon [16] in which gravitational counter terms are added to eliminate derivatives higher than second order in general space-time. In other words, the covariant Galileon falls in a class of Horndeski theories, while the covariantized Galileon does not.

In order to study the cosmological dynamics based on GLPV theories, we need to take into account matter fields (such as non-relativistic matter and radiation) other than the scalar field χ responsible for dark energy. In the presence of an additional scalar field ϕ with a kinetic energy $X = \partial_\mu\phi\partial^\mu\phi$, the conditions for eliminating derivatives higher than second order have been derived in Ref. [33] for the action depending on ϕ and X as well as on other ADM scalar quantities. In Ref. [33] the authors also obtained conditions for the avoidance of ghosts and Laplacian instabilities associated with scalar and tensor perturbations. In GLPV theories it was recognized that the matter propagation speed c_m is affected by the scalar degree of freedom χ [35], but this is not the case for Horndeski theories [33, 43].

In this paper, we derive propagation speeds of scalar and tensor perturbations as well as no-ghost conditions in GLPV theories in the presence of multiple matter fields on the flat FLRW background. In addition to the dark energy field χ, we take into account scalar fields ϕ_I $(I = 1, 2, \cdots, N-1)$ with the Lagrangians $P^{(I)}(X_I)$ depending on $X_I = \partial_\mu\phi_I\partial^\mu\phi_I$. This prescription can accommodate the perfect fluids of radiation and non-relativistic matter [44, 45]. We obtain an algebraic equation for the propagation speeds of multiple scalar fields and estimate to what extent the difference arises by going beyond Horndeski theories.

We then apply our results to two different theories– covariantized Galileon and covariant Galileon. Since the difference between them appears only in the functions B_i but not in the functions A_i, the background equations of motion for the covariantized Galileon are exactly the same as those for the covariant Galileon. At the level of perturbations, however, these two theories can be clearly distinguished from each other. For the covariantized Galileon the propagation speed square c_{s1}^2 of the field χ becomes negative in the deep matter era for late-time tracking solutions, whereas in the covariant Galileon it remains positive. We also show that the matter sound speed squares of the fields ϕ_I for the covariantized Galileon are similar to those for the covariant Galileon.

Our paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II we briefly review GLPV theories and derive the background equations of motion on the flat FLRW space-time. In Sec. III we obtain the second-order action for scalar/tensor perturbations in GLPV theories with multiple scalar fields. We derive not only no-ghost conditions but also an N-th order algebraic equation for the scalar propagation speed squares c_s^2. In Sec. IV we study the cosmology based on the two Galileon theories (covariantized and covariant Galileons). We discuss how these theories can be distinguished from each other, paying particular attention to the evolution of the scalar propagation speeds. Sec. V is devoted to conclusions.

II. GLPV THEORIES AND THE BACKGROUND EQUATIONS OF MOTION ON THE FLAT FLRW BACKGROUND

We employ the $3+1$ decomposition in the ADM formalism described by the line element

$$ds^2 = g_{\mu\nu}dx^\mu dx^\nu = -N^2dt^2 + h_{ij}(dx^i + N^i dt)(dx^j + N^j dt)\,, \tag{2.1}$$

where N is the lapse, N^i is the shift vector, and h_{ij} is the three-dimensional metric. A unit normal vector orthogonal to constant time hypersurfaces Σ_t is given by $n_\mu = (-N, 0, 0, 0)$ with the normalization $n_\mu n^\mu = -1$. The extrinsic curvature of Σ_t is defined by

$$K_{\mu\nu} \equiv h_\mu^\lambda h_\nu^\sigma\, n_{\sigma;\lambda} = n_{\nu;\mu} + n_\mu n^\lambda n_{\nu;\lambda}\,, \tag{2.2}$$

where a semicolon represents a covariant derivative. In the second equality of Eq. (2.2) we have used the fact that the three-dimensional metric $h_{\mu\nu}$ can be expressed as $h_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu} + n_\mu n_\nu$. The internal geometry of the hypersurfaces is characterized by the three-dimensional Ricci tensor $\mathcal{R}_{\mu\nu} \equiv {}^{(3)}R_{\mu\nu}$.

The EFT of cosmological perturbations advocated in Refs. [17]-[28] is based on the combination of geometric scalar quantities:

$$K \equiv K^\mu{}_\mu\,, \qquad \mathcal{S} \equiv K_{\mu\nu}K^{\mu\nu}\,, \qquad \mathcal{R} \equiv \mathcal{R}^\mu{}_\mu\,, \qquad \mathcal{Z} \equiv \mathcal{R}_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{R}^{\mu\nu}\,, \qquad \mathcal{U} \equiv \mathcal{R}_{\mu\nu}K^{\mu\nu}\,, \tag{2.3}$$

as well as the lapse N. We assume the existence of a scalar degree of freedom χ with the kinetic energy $Y \equiv g^{\mu\nu}\partial_\mu\chi\partial_\nu\chi$. We choose the unitary gauge in which the constant field hypersurfaces coincide with the constant time hypersurfaces. Since $\chi = \chi(t)$ and $Y = -N^{-2}\dot{\chi}(t)^2$, the χ and Y dependence in the Lagrangian L can be interpreted as the N and t dependence.

Expanding the Lagrangian $L(N, K, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{U}; t)$ up to second order of perturbations on the flat FLRW background with the line-element $ds^2 = -dt^2 + a^2(t)\delta_{ij}dx^i dx^j$, Gleyzes *et al.* [28] showed that the *linear* perturbation equations of motion are of second order under the conditions

$$L_{KK} + 4HL_{\mathcal{S}K} + 4H^2 L_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{S}} + 2L_{\mathcal{S}} = 0\,, \tag{2.4}$$

$$L_{K\mathcal{R}} + 2HL_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}} + \frac{1}{2}L_{\mathcal{U}} + HL_{K\mathcal{U}} + 2H^2 L_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{U}} = 0\,, \tag{2.5}$$

$$4\left(L_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{R}} + 2HL_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{U}} + H^2 L_{\mathcal{U}\mathcal{U}}\right) + 3L_{\mathcal{Z}} = 0\,, \tag{2.6}$$

where $H \equiv \dot{a}/a$ is the Hubble parameter (a dot represents the derivative with respect to the time t), and a lower index of L denotes the partial derivatives with respect to the scalar quantities, e.g., $L_{\mathcal{S}} = \partial L/\partial \mathcal{S}$. Equations (2.4)-(2.6) are sufficient conditions for eliminating spatial derivatives higher than second order.

Let us consider four-dimensional Horndeski theories described by the Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned} L \;=\; & G_2(\chi, Y) + G_3(\chi, Y)\Box\chi + G_4(\chi, Y)R - 2G_{4Y}(\chi, Y)\left[(\Box\chi)^2 - \chi^{;\mu\nu}\chi_{;\mu\nu}\right] \\ & + G_5(\chi, Y)G_{\mu\nu}\chi^{;\mu\nu} + G_{5Y}(\chi, Y)\left[(\Box\chi)^3 - 3(\Box\chi)\chi_{;\mu\nu}\chi^{;\mu\nu} + 2\chi_{;\mu\nu}\chi^{;\mu\sigma}\chi^{;\nu}{}_{;\sigma}\right]/3\,, \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

where G_i $(i = 2, 3, 4, 5)$ are generic functions of χ and Y with $G_{iY} = \partial G_i/\partial Y$, R and $G_{\mu\nu}$ are the Ricci scalar and the Einstein tensor in four dimensions. In terms of the ADM scalar quantities the Lagrangian (2.7) can be expressed as [28]

$$L = A_2 + A_3 K + A_4(K^2 - \mathcal{S}) + B_4\mathcal{R} + A_5 K_3 + B_5\left(\mathcal{U} - K\mathcal{R}/2\right)\,, \tag{2.8}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} & A_2 = G_2 - YF_{3\chi}\,, \qquad A_3 = 2(-Y)^{3/2}F_{3Y} - 2\sqrt{-Y}G_{4\chi}\,, \qquad A_4 = 2YG_{4Y} - G_4 + YG_{5\chi}/2\,, \\ & B_4 = G_4 + Y(G_{5\chi} - F_{5\chi})/2\,, \qquad A_5 = -(-Y)^{3/2}G_{5Y}/3\,, \qquad B_5 = -\sqrt{-Y}F_5\,. \end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

The lower indices χ and Y represent the partial derivatives with respect to χ and Y, respectively. We have introduced two auxiliary functions F_3 and F_5 satisfying $G_3 = F_3 + 2YF_{3Y}$ and $G_{5Y} = F_5/(2Y) + F_{5Y}$. The quantity K_3 in the Lagrangian (2.8) is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} K_3 \;\equiv\; & K^3 - 3KK_{ij}K^{ij} + 2K_{ij}K^{il}K^j{}_l \\ =\; & 3H(2H^2 - 2KH + K^2 - \mathcal{S}) + O(3)\,, \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

where the second equality is valid up to quadratic order in perturbations. From Eq. (2.9) the coefficients A_4, B_4, A_5, B_5 in Horndeski theories are related with each other as

$$A_4 = 2YB_{4Y} - B_4\,, \qquad A_5 = -YB_{5Y}/3\,. \tag{2.11}$$

The GLPV theories [35] correspond to the Lagrangian (2.8) in which the conditions (2.11) do not necessarily hold. It is clear that the Lagrangian (2.8) satisfies the three conditions (2.4)-(2.6) even without the restriction (2.11), so the linear perturbation equations of motion on the FLRW background do not contain derivatives higher than second order.

In the presence of an additional matter fluid, we derive the background equations of motion for the action

$$S = \int d^4x\sqrt{-g}\,L + S^M\,, \tag{2.12}$$

where L is given by Eq. (2.8). In unitary gauge, the functions A_i and B_i depend on t and N through the relations $\chi = \chi(t)$ and $Y = -N^{-2}\dot{\chi}(t)^2$. S^M is the matter action with energy density ρ_M and pressure P_M.

On the flat FLRW background, the equations of motion can be derived by expanding the action (2.12) up to first order in perturbations and by varying the first-order action in terms of δN and $\delta\sqrt{h}$, where h is the determinant of the three-dimensional metric h_{ij} [28]. They are given, respectively, by

$$\bar{L} + L_N - 3H\mathcal{F} = \rho_M\,, \tag{2.13}$$

$$\bar{L} - \dot{\mathcal{F}} - 3H\mathcal{F} = -P_M\,, \tag{2.14}$$

where $\bar{L}$ is the background value of L, and $\mathcal{F} \equiv L_K + 2HL_{\mathcal{S}}$. On using the properties $\bar{K} = 3H$, $\bar{\mathcal{S}} = 3H^2$, $\bar{K}_3 = 6H^3$, and $\bar{\mathcal{R}} = \bar{\mathcal{U}} = 0$, Eqs. (2.13) and (2.14) read

$$A_2 - 6H^2 A_4 - 12H^3 A_5 + 2\dot{\chi}^2 \left(A_{2Y} + 3H A_{3Y} + 6H^2 A_{4Y} + 6H^3 A_{5Y} \right) = \rho_M \,, \tag{2.15}$$

$$A_2 - 6H^2 A_4 - 12H^3 A_5 - \dot{A}_3 - 4\dot{H} A_4 - 4H\dot{A}_4 - 12H\dot{H} A_5 - 6H^2 \dot{A}_5 = -P_M \,. \tag{2.16}$$

Substituting the functions A_i of Eq. (2.9) into Eqs. (2.15)-(2.16), we reproduce the background equations of motion in Horndeski theories [41, 46] derived by the direct variation of the action (2.12) with (2.7).

Equations (2.15) and (2.16) do not contain the functions B_4 and B_5. This means that, at the background level, the theories with same values of A_2, A_3, A_4, A_5 but with different values of B_4 and B_5 cannot be distinguished from each other. In fact, this happens for the covariantized Galileon and the covariant Galileon mentioned in Introduction. However, it is possible to distinguish between such theories at the level of perturbations. We shall address this issue in Sec. IV.

III. COSMOLOGICAL PERTURBATIONS AND PROPAGATION SPEEDS OF TENSOR AND SCALAR MODES

In this section, we derive no-ghost conditions and scalar propagation speeds for the theory described by the Lagrangian $L(N, K, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{U}; t)$ in the presence of multiple scalar fields ϕ_I ($I = 1, 2, \cdots, N-1$). As we already mentioned, we choose the unitary gauge in which the perturbation of the field χ vanishes ($\delta\chi = 0$). The k-essence Lagrangian $P^{(I)}(X_I)$ with a kinetic energy $X_I \equiv g^{\mu\nu}\partial_\mu\phi_I\partial_\nu\phi_I$ can describe the perturbation of a barotropic perfect fluid [33, 44, 45]. Let us then consider the theory with N scalar fields (χ and $\phi_1, \cdots, \phi_{N-1}$) given by the action

$$S = \int d^4x\sqrt{-g} \left[L(N, K, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{U}; t) + \sum_{I=1}^{N-1} P^{(I)}(X_I) \right] , \tag{3.1}$$

which covers the theory (2.12) with (2.8) as a special case. The energy density $\rho^{(I)}$ and the equation of state w_I of the scalar field ϕ_I are given, respectively, by

$$\rho^{(I)} = 2X_I P^{(I)}_{X_I} - P^{(I)} \,, \qquad w_I = \frac{P^{(I)}}{2X_I P^{(I)}_{X_I} - P^{(I)}} \,, \tag{3.2}$$

where $P^{(I)}_{X_I} = \partial P^{(I)}/\partial X_I$. Then, the total energy density ρ_M and the pressure P_M of the scalar fields $\phi_1, \cdots, \phi_{N-1}$ read

$$\rho_M = \sum_{I=1}^{N-1} \left[2X_I P^{(I)}_{X_I} - P^{(I)} \right] , \qquad P_M = \sum_{I=1}^{N-1} P^{(I)} \,. \tag{3.3}$$

Combining Eqs. (2.13) and (2.14), we obtain

$$L_N + \dot{\mathcal{F}} = \sum_{I=1}^{N-1} 2X_I P^{(I)}_{X_I} \,. \tag{3.4}$$

In Sec. IV A we will show that the above k-essence description can accommodate non-relativistic matter and radiation by choosing specific forms of $P^{(1)}(X_1)$ and $P^{(2)}(X_2)$.

In Ref. [33] the conditions for eliminating derivatives higher than quadratic order were derived for the two-field action $S = \int d^4x\sqrt{-g}\, L(N, K, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{U}, \phi_1, X_1; t)$. In this case, the higher-order spatial derivatives do not appear under the conditions (2.4)-(2.6). The mixture of temporal and spatial derivatives higher than second order can be eliminated under the conditions $L_{KX_1} + 2HL_{\mathcal{S}X_1} = 0$ and $L_{\mathcal{R}X_1} + HL_{\mathcal{U}X_1} = 0$ [33]. For the separate Lagrangian $L(N, K, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{U}; t) + P^{(1)}(X_1)$, these two conditions are automatically satisfied. This is also the case for the action (3.1) of N scalar fields. In the following we study the perturbations for the action (3.1) with the Lagrangian (2.8), in which case the higher-order temporal and spatial derivatives are absent.

We now expand the action (3.1) up to second order in perturbations. In doing so, we express the three-dimensional metric h_{ij} and the shift N_i in the form [47]

$$h_{ij} = a^2(t) e^{2\zeta} \hat{h}_{ij} \,, \qquad \hat{h}_{ij} = \delta_{ij} + \gamma_{ij} + \gamma_{il}\gamma_{lj}/2 \,, \qquad \det \hat{h} = 1 \,, \tag{3.5}$$

$$N_i = \partial_i \psi \equiv \partial\psi/\partial x^i \,, \tag{3.6}$$

where ζ and ψ are the scalar perturbations and γ_{ij} is the tensor perturbation satisfying traceless and transverse conditions $\gamma_{ii} = \partial_i \gamma_{ij} = 0$.

The second-order action for the tensor mode is the same as that derived in Refs. [28, 33]:

$$S_h^{(2)} = \int d^4x \frac{a^3}{4} L_{\mathcal{S}} \left[\dot{\gamma}_{ij}^2 - c_t^2 \frac{(\partial_k \gamma_{ij})^2}{a^2} \right] , \tag{3.7}$$

where the propagation speed c_t is given by

$$c_t^2 = \frac{\mathcal{E}}{L_{\mathcal{S}}} , \qquad \mathcal{E} \equiv L_{\mathcal{R}} + \frac{1}{2}\dot{L}_{\mathcal{U}} + \frac{3}{2} H L_{\mathcal{U}} . \tag{3.8}$$

The tensor ghosts and Laplacian instabilities are absent under the conditions

$$L_{\mathcal{S}} > 0 , \tag{3.9}$$

$$\mathcal{E} > 0 . \tag{3.10}$$

For the scalar perturbations the second-order action can be written in the form $S_s^{(2)} = \int d^4x \, \mathcal{L}_2$, with the Lagrangian density

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_2 &= \delta\sqrt{h}[(\dot{\mathcal{F}} + L_N)\delta N + \mathcal{E}\delta_1\mathcal{R}] + a^3[(L_N + L_{NN}/2)\delta N^2 + \mathcal{E}\delta_2\mathcal{R} + \mathcal{A}\delta K^2/2 + \mathcal{B}\delta K\delta N + \mathcal{C}\delta K\delta_1\mathcal{R} \\ &\quad + (\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{E})\delta N\delta_1\mathcal{R} + \mathcal{G}\delta_1\mathcal{R}^2/2 + L_{\mathcal{S}}\delta K^\mu_\nu \delta K^\nu_\mu + L_{\mathcal{Z}}\delta\mathcal{R}^\mu_\nu\delta\mathcal{R}^\nu_\mu] + \mathcal{L}_2^M , \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{A} \equiv L_{KK} + 4HL_{\mathcal{S}K} + 4H^2 L_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{S}} , \qquad \mathcal{B} \equiv L_{KN} + 2HL_{\mathcal{S}N} , \qquad \mathcal{C} \equiv L_{K\mathcal{R}} + 2HL_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{R}} + L_{\mathcal{U}}/2 + HL_{K\mathcal{U}} + 2H^2 L_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{U}} , \\ &\mathcal{D} \equiv L_{N\mathcal{R}} - \dot{L}_{\mathcal{U}}/2 + HL_{N\mathcal{U}} , \qquad \mathcal{G} \equiv L_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{R}} + 2HL_{\mathcal{R}\mathcal{U}} + H^2 L_{\mathcal{U}\mathcal{U}} . \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

The Lagrangian density $\mathcal{L}_2^M$ corresponds to the contribution coming from the matter fields ϕ_I:

$$\mathcal{L}_2^M \equiv \sum_{I=1}^{N-1} \left[P_{X_I}^{(I)} \delta\sqrt{h}\, \delta_1 X_I + a^3 \left(P_{X_I}^{(I)} \delta_2 X_I + P_{X_I X_I}^{(I)} \delta_1 X_I^2/2 + P_{X_I}^{(I)} \delta N \delta_1 X_I \right) \right] , \tag{3.13}$$

where the first-order and second-order contributions to X_I are given, respectively, by

$$\delta_1 X_I = 2\dot{\phi}_I^2 \delta N - 2\dot{\phi}_I \dot{\delta\phi}_I , \tag{3.14}$$

$$\delta_2 X_I = -\dot{\delta\phi}_I^2 - 3\dot{\phi}_I^2 \delta N^2 + 4\dot{\phi}_I \dot{\delta\phi}_I \delta N + \frac{2\dot{\phi}_I}{a^2} \partial_j\psi\partial_j\delta\phi_I + \frac{1}{a^2}(\partial\delta\phi_I)^2 , \tag{3.15}$$

with $(\partial\delta\phi_I)^2 \equiv \partial_j\delta\phi_I \partial_j\delta\phi_I$ (the quantities with the same lower index j are summed). On using Eq. (3.4), one can eliminate some of the terms involving ζ. Recall that the Lagrangian (2.8) satisfies the relations (2.4)-(2.6), i.e., $\mathcal{A} + 2L_{\mathcal{S}} = 0$, $\mathcal{C} = 0$, and $4\mathcal{G} + 3L_{\mathcal{Z}} = 0$. On using the relations $\delta\sqrt{h} = 3a^3\zeta$, $\delta\mathcal{R}_{ij} = -(\delta_{ij}\partial^2\zeta + \partial_i\partial_j\zeta)$, $\delta_1\mathcal{R} = -4a^{-2}\partial^2\zeta$, $\delta_2\mathcal{R} = -2a^{-2}[(\partial\zeta)^2 - 4\zeta\partial^2\zeta]$, $\delta K^i_j = (\dot{\zeta} - H\delta N)\delta^i_j - \delta^{ik}(\partial_k N_j + \partial_j N_k)/(2a^2)$, and $\delta K = 3(\dot{\zeta} - H\delta N) - \partial^2\psi/a^2$ [28, 33] with the notation $\partial^2\zeta \equiv \partial_j\partial_j\zeta$, the Lagrangian density (3.11) can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_2 &= a^3 \left\{ \frac{1}{2}(2L_N + L_{NN} - 6H\mathcal{W} + 12H^2 L_{\mathcal{S}})\delta N^2 + \left[\mathcal{W}\left(3\dot{\zeta} - \frac{\partial^2\psi}{a^2} \right) - 4(\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{E})\frac{\partial^2\zeta}{a^2} \right] \delta N + 4L_{\mathcal{S}}\dot{\zeta}\frac{\partial^2\psi}{a^2} \right. \\ &\quad -6L_{\mathcal{S}}\dot{\zeta}^2 + 2\mathcal{E}\frac{(\partial\zeta)^2}{a^2} + \sum_{I=1}^{N-1} \left[(2\dot{\phi}_I^2 P_{X_I X_I}^{(I)} - P_{X_I}^{(I)})(\dot{\phi}_I^2 \delta N^2 - 2\dot{\phi}_I \dot{\delta\phi}_I \delta N + \dot{\delta\phi}_I^2) - 6\dot{\phi}_I P_{X_I}^{(I)} \zeta \dot{\delta\phi}_I \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. -2\dot{\phi}_I P_{X_I}^{(I)} \delta\phi_I \frac{\partial^2\psi}{a^2} + P_{X_I}^{(I)} \frac{(\partial\delta\phi_I)^2}{a^2} \right] \right\} , \end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

where

$$\mathcal{W} \equiv L_{KN} + 2HL_{\mathcal{S}N} + 4HL_{\mathcal{S}} . \tag{3.17}$$

Varying the Lagrangian density (3.16) with respect to δN and $\partial^2\psi$, we obtain the Hamiltonian and momentum constraints

$$(2L_N + L_{NN} - 6H\mathcal{W} + 12H^2 L_{\mathcal{S}})\delta N + \mathcal{W}\left(3\dot{\zeta} - \frac{\partial^2\psi}{a^2}\right) - 4(\mathcal{D}+\mathcal{E})\frac{\partial^2\zeta}{a^2}$$
$$+ \sum_{I=1}^{N-1} 2\dot{\phi}_I (P^{(I)}_{X_I} - 2\dot{\phi}_I^2 P^{(I)}_{X_I X_I})(\delta\dot{\phi}_I - \dot{\phi}_I \delta N) = 0\,, \tag{3.18}$$

$$\mathcal{W}\delta N - 4L_{\mathcal{S}}\dot{\zeta} + \sum_{I=1}^{N-1} 2\dot{\phi}_I P^{(I)}_{X_I}\delta\phi_I = 0\,. \tag{3.19}$$

Solving Eqs. (3.18)-(3.19) for δN, $\partial^2\psi$ and substituting the resulting relations into Eq. (3.16), the second-order Lagrangian density can be written in the form

$$\mathcal{L}_2 = a^3\left(\dot{\vec{\mathcal{X}}}^t \boldsymbol{K}\dot{\vec{\mathcal{X}}} - \frac{1}{a^2}\partial_j\vec{\mathcal{X}}^t\boldsymbol{G}\partial_j\vec{\mathcal{X}} - \vec{\mathcal{X}}^t\boldsymbol{B}\dot{\vec{\mathcal{X}}} - \vec{\mathcal{X}}^t\boldsymbol{M}\vec{\mathcal{X}}\right), \tag{3.20}$$

where $\boldsymbol{K}$, $\boldsymbol{G}$, $\boldsymbol{B}$, $\boldsymbol{M}$ are $N\times N$ matrices, and the vector $\vec{\mathcal{X}}$ is composed from the dimensionless multiple fields, as

$$\vec{\mathcal{X}}^t = (\zeta, \delta\phi_1/M_{\rm pl}, \cdots, \delta\phi_{N-1}/M_{\rm pl})\,. \tag{3.21}$$

Here $M_{\rm pl}$ is the reduced Planck mass.

The two matrices $\boldsymbol{K}$ and $\boldsymbol{G}$ determine no-ghost conditions and the scalar propagation speeds. Their components are given by

$$K_{11} = \frac{2L_{\mathcal{S}}}{\mathcal{W}^2}\left(g_2 + \frac{8L_{\mathcal{S}}}{M_{\rm pl}^2}\sum_{I=2}^{N}\dot{\phi}_{I-1}^2 K_{II}\right), \qquad K_{II} = \left[2\dot{\phi}_{I-1}^2 P^{(I-1)}_{X_{I-1}X_{I-1}} - P^{(I-1)}_{X_{I-1}}\right]M_{\rm pl}^2\,,$$
$$K_{1I} = K_{I1} = -\frac{4L_{\mathcal{S}}\dot{\phi}_{I-1}}{M_{\rm pl}\mathcal{W}}K_{II}\,, \tag{3.22}$$

$$G_{11} = -\frac{1}{2}\left(\dot{\mathcal{C}}_3 + H\mathcal{C}_3 + 4\mathcal{E}\right), \qquad G_{II} = -P^{(I-1)}_{X_{I-1}}M_{\rm pl}^2\,, \qquad G_{1I} = G_{I1} = \frac{\mathcal{C}_3\dot{\phi}_{I-1}}{4L_{\mathcal{S}}M_{\rm pl}}G_{II}\,, \tag{3.23}$$

where $2\le I\le N$ and other components are 0. The functions g_2 and $\mathcal{C}_3$ are defined by

$$g_2 \equiv 4L_{\mathcal{S}}(2L_N + L_{NN}) + 3(L_{KN} + 2HL_{\mathcal{S}N})^2\,, \tag{3.24}$$
$$\mathcal{C}_3 \equiv -\frac{16L_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{D}+\mathcal{E})}{\mathcal{W}}\,. \tag{3.25}$$

For the derivation of G_{11} we have used the property that the integral $\int d^4x\, a\mathcal{C}_3\dot{\zeta}\partial^2\zeta$ reduces to $\int d^4x\,(a/2)(\dot{\mathcal{C}}_3 + H\mathcal{C}_3)(\partial\zeta)^2$ up to a boundary term.

If the symmetric matrix $\boldsymbol{K}$ is positive definite, the scalar ghosts are absent. The necessary and sufficient conditions for the positivity of $\boldsymbol{K}$ are that the determinants of principal submatrices of $\boldsymbol{K}$ are positive, i.e.,

$$\frac{2L_{\mathcal{S}}}{\mathcal{W}^2}\prod_{I=2}^{\ell}K_{II}\left(g_2 + \frac{8L_{\mathcal{S}}}{M_{\rm pl}^2}\sum_{J=\ell+1}^{N}\dot{\phi}_{J-1}^2 K_{JJ}\right) > 0 \qquad (\ell = 1,2,\cdots,N)\,, \tag{3.26}$$

where we should understand that $\prod_{I=2}^{\ell}K_{II} = 1$ for $\ell = 1$ and $\sum_{J=\ell+1}^{N}\dot{\phi}_{J-1}^2 K_{JJ} = 0$ for $\ell = N$. Under the tensor no-ghost condition (3.9), all the N conditions (3.26) hold for $g_2 > 0$ and $K_{II} > 0$ ($I = 2,3,\cdots,N$). Hence the scalar ghost is absent for

$$g_2 = 4L_{\mathcal{S}}(2L_N + L_{NN}) + 3(L_{KN} + 2HL_{\mathcal{S}N})^2 > 0\,, \tag{3.27}$$
$$2\dot{\phi}_I^2 P^{(I)}_{X_I X_I} - P^{(I)}_{X_I} > 0 \qquad (I = 1,2,\cdots,N-1). \tag{3.28}$$

The dispersion relation following from the Lagrangian (3.20) in the limit of a large wave number k with a frequency ω is given by

$$\det\left(\omega^2\boldsymbol{K} - k^2\boldsymbol{G}/a^2\right) = 0\,. \tag{3.29}$$

Introducing the scalar sound speed c_s as $\omega^2 = c_s^2\, k^2/a^2$, Eq. (3.29) reduces to

$$\prod_{I=1}^{N}\left(c_s^2\, K_{II} - G_{II}\right) - \sum_{I=2}^{N}\left[\left(c_s^2\, K_{1I} - G_{1I}\right)^2 \prod_{J\neq I, J\geq 2}^{N}\left(c_s^2\, K_{JJ} - G_{JJ}\right)\right] = 0\,. \tag{3.30}$$

For the theory described by the Lagrangian (2.8), it follows that

$$\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{E} = B_4 + B_{4N} - \frac{1}{2}HB_{5N}\,, \qquad L_{\mathcal{S}} = -A_4 - 3HA_5\,. \tag{3.31}$$

We recall that in Horndeski theories the relation (2.11) holds, and hence $\mathcal{D}+\mathcal{E} = L_{\mathcal{S}}$. Then, the term $\mathcal{C}_3$ in Eq. (3.25) reads

$$\mathcal{C}_{3\mathrm{H}} = -\frac{16L_{\mathcal{S}}^2}{\mathcal{W}}\,, \tag{3.32}$$

where the lower index "H" represents the values in Horndeski theories. Substituting the relation (3.32) into Eq. (3.23) and using Eq. (3.22), the propagation speed $c_{s\mathrm{H}}$ in Horndeski theories satisfies

$$c_{s\mathrm{H}}^2 K_{1I} - G_{1I} = -\frac{4L_{\mathcal{S}}\dot{\phi}_{I-1}}{M_{\mathrm{pl}}\mathcal{W}}\left(c_{s\mathrm{H}}^2 K_{II} - G_{II}\right)\,. \tag{3.33}$$

Plugging Eq. (3.33) into Eq. (3.30), we obtain the following algebraic equation

$$\left[c_{s\mathrm{H}}^2 K_{11} - G_{11} - \left(\frac{4L_{\mathcal{S}}}{M_{\mathrm{pl}}\mathcal{W}}\right)^2 \sum_{I=2}^{N}\dot{\phi}_{I-1}^2\left(c_{s\mathrm{H}}^2 K_{II} - G_{II}\right)\right]\prod_{I=2}^{N}\left(c_{s\mathrm{H}}^2 K_{II} - G_{II}\right) = 0\,, \tag{3.34}$$

whose solutions are given by

$$c_{s\mathrm{H}1}^2 = \frac{G_{11} - [4L_{\mathcal{S}}/(M_{\mathrm{pl}}\mathcal{W})]^2\sum_{I=2}^{N}\dot{\phi}_{I-1}^2 G_{II}}{K_{11} - [4L_{\mathcal{S}}/(M_{\mathrm{pl}}\mathcal{W})]^2\sum_{I=2}^{N}\dot{\phi}_{I-1}^2 K_{II}} = \frac{\mathcal{W}^2}{2L_{\mathcal{S}}g_2}\left[G_{11} + \frac{16L_{\mathcal{S}}^2}{\mathcal{W}^2}\sum_{I=2}^{N}\dot{\phi}_{I-1}^2 P_{X_{I-1}}^{(I-1)}\right]\,, \tag{3.35}$$

$$c_{s\mathrm{H}I}^2 = \frac{G_{II}}{K_{II}} = \frac{P_{X_{I-1}}^{(I-1)}}{P_{X_{I-1}}^{(I-1)} - 2\dot{\phi}_{I-1}^2 P_{X_{I-1}X_{I-1}}^{(I-1)}} \qquad (I = 2, 3, \cdots, N)\,. \tag{3.36}$$

The matter sound speed square (3.36) coincides with that derived in Ref. [48] in the context of single-field k-inflation. In Horndeski theories, each $c_{s\mathrm{H}I}$ $(I \geq 2)$ is not affected by other scalar fields. The presence of the matter fields ϕ_I gives rise to modifications to the first propagation speed $c_{s\mathrm{H}1}$, which was already derived in Ref. [33] for $N = 2$.

In GLPV theories where the conditions (2.11) are not satisfied, we cannot write Eq. (3.30) in the separate form like Eq. (3.34). On using the propagation speeds (3.35) and (3.36), Eq. (3.30) can be written in the following form:

$$\prod_{I=1}^{N}\left(c_s^2 - c_{s\mathrm{H}I}^2\right) = -\frac{8L_{\mathcal{S}}}{g_2}\left(\frac{\mathcal{C}_3\mathcal{W}}{16L_{\mathcal{S}}^2} + 1\right)\sum_{I=2}^{N}\left[\dot{\phi}_{I-1}^2 P_{X_{I-1}}^{(I-1)}\left\{2c_s^2 + c_{s\mathrm{H}I}^2\left(\frac{\mathcal{C}_3\mathcal{W}}{16L_{\mathcal{S}}^2} - 1\right)\right\}\prod_{J\neq I, J\geq 2}^{N}\left(c_s^2 - c_{s\mathrm{H}J}^2\right)\right]\,, \tag{3.37}$$

where, for $N = 2$, $\prod_{J\neq I, J\geq 2}^{N}(c_s^2 - c_{s\mathrm{H}J}^2) = 1$. Since $\mathcal{C}_3 \neq -16L_{\mathcal{S}}^2/\mathcal{W}$ in GLPV theories, the right hand side of Eq. (3.37) does not vanish. Hence c_s^2 differs from the value $c_{s\mathrm{H}I}^2$. This means that not only the propagation speed $c_{s\mathrm{H}1}$ but also the matter sound speeds $c_{s\mathrm{H}I}$ $(I \geq 2)$ are affected by the presence of other scalar fields. When $N = 2$, Eq. (3.37) reduces to

$$\left(c_s^2 - c_{s\mathrm{H}1}^2\right)\left(c_s^2 - c_{s\mathrm{H}2}^2\right) = -\frac{8L_{\mathcal{S}}}{g_2}\left(\frac{\mathcal{C}_3\mathcal{W}}{16L_{\mathcal{S}}^2} + 1\right)\dot{\phi}_1^2 P_{X_1}^{(1)}\left[2c_s^2 + c_{s\mathrm{H}2}^2\left(\frac{\mathcal{C}_3\mathcal{W}}{16L_{\mathcal{S}}^2} - 1\right)\right]\,, \tag{3.38}$$

which agrees with Eq. (22) of Ref. [35].[1]

---

[1] In Ref. [35] the definition of the first propagation speed square is given by

$$\tilde{c}_{s\mathrm{H}1}^2 = \frac{\mathcal{W}^2}{2L_{\mathcal{S}}g_2}\left[G_{11} + \left(\frac{\mathcal{C}_3}{4L_{\mathcal{S}}}\right)^2\dot{\phi}_1^2 P_{X_1}^{(1)}\right]\,,$$

whereas the definition of $c_{s\mathrm{H}2}^2$ is the same as ours. In the Horndeski limit $\mathcal{C}_3 \to -16L_{\mathcal{S}}^2/\mathcal{W}$, $c_{s\mathrm{H}1}^2$ is identical to $\tilde{c}_{s\mathrm{H}1}^2$.

Let us consider the case in which the deviation of $\mathcal{C}_3$ from the value $-16L_{\mathcal{S}}^2/\mathcal{W}$ is small, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{C}_3 = -\frac{16L_{\mathcal{S}}^2}{\mathcal{W}}\left(1+\delta\mathcal{C}_3\right), \qquad |\delta\mathcal{C}_3| \ll 1\,. \tag{3.39}$$

Under this approximation we write the two solutions for c_s^2 in Eq. (3.37), as

$$c_{s1}^2 = c_{s\mathrm{H}1}^2 + \delta c_{s1}^2\,, \tag{3.40}$$
$$c_{sI}^2 = c_{s\mathrm{H}I}^2 + \delta c_{sI}^2 \qquad (I=2,3,\cdots,N)\,. \tag{3.41}$$

Substituting Eq. (3.40) into Eq. (3.37), we obtain

$$\delta c_{s1}^2 \simeq \sum_{I=2}^{N} \xi_{I-1}\,\delta\mathcal{C}_3\,, \tag{3.42}$$

where

$$\xi_I \equiv \frac{16L_{\mathcal{S}}\dot{\phi}_I^2 P_{X_I}^{(I)}}{g_2}\,. \tag{3.43}$$

When we substitute the solution (3.41) into Eq. (3.37), we employ the approximation $|\delta c_{sI}^2| \ll c_{s\mathrm{H}I}^2$, whose validity should be checked after deriving the solution of δc_{sI}^2. It then follows that

$$\delta c_{sI}^2 \simeq -\frac{c_{s\mathrm{H}I}^2}{2(c_{s\mathrm{H}I}^2 - c_{s\mathrm{H}1}^2 - \delta c_{s1}^2)}\xi_{I-1}\delta\mathcal{C}_3^2 \qquad (I=2,3,\cdots,N). \tag{3.44}$$

If the quantities $|\xi_{I-1}|$ $(I \geq 2)$ are much larger than 1, it is possible to have $|\delta c_{s1}^2|$ of the order of 1 even for $|\delta\mathcal{C}_3| \ll 1$. In fact, this happens for the cosmology of the covariantized Galileon studied in Sec. IV. On the other hand, δc_{sI}^2 $(I \geq 2)$ contains an additional suppression factor $\delta\mathcal{C}_3$. In the cosmological epoch where the field ϕ_{I-1} $(I \geq 2)$ dominates the energy density of the Universe, we have $\delta c_{s1}^2 \simeq \xi_{I-1}\,\delta\mathcal{C}_3$ from Eq. (3.42). Provided that the terms $|\delta c_{s1}^2|$ and $|c_{s\mathrm{H}I}^2 - c_{s\mathrm{H}1}^2|$ are at most of the order of 1, it follows that $|\delta c_{sI}^2| \ll c_{s\mathrm{H}I}^2$. This discussion implies that the deviation from Horndeski theories may potentially lead to a considerable modification to $c_{s\mathrm{H}1}^2$, but the modification to $c_{s\mathrm{H}I}^2$ $(I \geq 2)$ should be suppressed. In Sec. IV D we shall study this issue for concrete models of dark energy.

IV. APPLICATION TO GALILEON THEORIES

The covariant Galileon advocated in Ref. [16] belongs to a class of the Horndeski Lagrangian (2.7) with the functions

$$G_2 = \frac{c_2}{2}Y\,, \qquad G_3 = \frac{c_3}{2M^3}Y\,, \qquad G_4 = \frac{M_{\rm pl}^2}{2} - \frac{c_4}{4M^6}Y^2\,, \qquad G_5 = \frac{3c_5}{4M^9}Y^2\,, \tag{4.1}$$

where $c_{2,3,4,5}$ are dimensionless constants and M is a constant having a dimension of mass. In this case the auxiliary functions F_3 and F_5 can be chosen as $F_3 = c_3 Y/(6M^3)$ and $F_5 = 3c_5Y^2/(5M^9)$, respectively. Then, the covariant Galileon [dubbed Model (A)] corresponds to the Lagrangian (2.8) with the functions

$$\text{Model (A)}: \quad A_2 = \frac{c_2}{2}Y\,, \qquad A_3 = \frac{c_3}{3M^3}(-Y)^{3/2}\,, \qquad A_4 = -\frac{M_{\rm pl}^2}{2} - \frac{3c_4}{4M^6}Y^2\,, \qquad A_5 = \frac{c_5}{2M^9}(-Y)^{5/2}\,,$$
$$B_4 = \frac{M_{\rm pl}^2}{2} - \frac{c_4}{4M^6}Y^2\,, \qquad B_5 = -\frac{3c_5}{5M^9}(-Y)^{5/2}\,. \tag{4.2}$$

The Lagrangian of the original Galileon [15] was constructed such that the field equations of motion satisfy the Galilean symmetry $\partial_\mu\phi \to \partial_\mu\phi + b_\mu$ in Minkowski space-time. In curved space-time, the covariantized version of the Minkowski Galileon follows by replacing partial derivatives of the field with covariant derivatives. Although this process generally gives rise to derivatives higher than second order, the equations of motion for the covariantized Galileon remain of second order on the isotropic cosmological background. Taking into account the Einstein-Hilbert term $(M_{\rm pl}^2/2)R$, the Lagrangian of the covariantized Galileon [dubbed Model (B)] is given by

$$\text{Model (B)}: \quad A_2 = \frac{c_2}{2}Y\,, \qquad A_3 = \frac{c_3}{3M^3}(-Y)^{3/2}\,, \qquad A_4 = -\frac{M_{\rm pl}^2}{2} - \frac{3c_4}{4M^6}Y^2\,, \qquad A_5 = \frac{c_5}{2M^9}(-Y)^{5/2}\,,$$
$$B_4 = \frac{M_{\rm pl}^2}{2}\,, \qquad B_5 = 0\,. \tag{4.3}$$

The additional terms $-c_4Y^2/(4M^6)$ and $-3c_5(-Y)^{5/2}/(5M^9)$ appearing in the terms B_4 and B_5 of the covariant Galileon Lagrangian (4.2) correspond to the gravitational counter terms that eliminate derivatives higher than second order in general space-time.

A. Background cosmology

Even though the coefficients B_4 and B_5 in Model (B) are different from those in Model (A), the coefficients A_i ($i = 2, 3, 4, 5$) are the same in both cases. Hence the background cosmological dynamics in Model (B) are exactly the same as those in Model (A). Substituting the functions A_i of Eqs. (4.2) and (4.3) into Eqs. (2.15) and (2.16), we obtain the equations of motion

$$3M_{\rm pl}^2H^2 = \rho_{\rm DE} + \rho_M \,, \tag{4.4}$$

$$3M_{\rm pl}^2H^2 + 2M_{\rm pl}^2\dot{H} = -P_{\rm DE} - P_M \,, \tag{4.5}$$

where the energy density $\rho_{\rm DE}$ and the pressure $P_{\rm DE}$ of the "dark" component are given by

$$\rho_{\rm DE} = -\frac{1}{2}c_2\dot{\chi}^2 + \frac{3c_3H\dot{\chi}^3}{M^3} - \frac{45c_4H^2\dot{\chi}^4}{2M^6} + \frac{21c_5H^3\dot{\chi}^5}{M^9} \,, \tag{4.6}$$

$$P_{\rm DE} = -\frac{1}{2}c_2\dot{\chi}^2 - \frac{c_3\dot{\chi}^2\ddot{\chi}}{M^3} + \frac{3c_4\dot{\chi}^3}{2M^6}\left[8H\ddot{\chi} + (3H^2+2\dot{H})\dot{\chi}\right] - \frac{3c_5H\dot{\chi}^4}{M^9}\left[5H\ddot{\chi} + 2(H^2+\dot{H})\dot{\chi}\right] . \tag{4.7}$$

Equations (4.4) and (4.5) coincide with those derived in Refs. [49, 50] for the covariant Galileon. The dark energy equation of state is defined by $w_{\rm DE} \equiv P_{\rm DE}/\rho_{\rm DE}$.

For the matter component labelled by the lower index "M" in Eqs. (4.4)-(4.5), we take into account radiation and non-relativistic matter. The perfect fluids of radiation and non-relativistic matter can be modeled by two scalar fields ϕ_1 and ϕ_2, respectively, with the Lagrangians

$$P^{(1)}(X_1) = b_1X_1^2 \,, \tag{4.8}$$

$$P^{(2)}(X_2) = b_2(X_2 - X_0)^2 \,, \tag{4.9}$$

where b_1, b_2, and X_0 are constants. If we add a constant term Λ to the Lagrangian (4.9), this corresponds to the unified model of dark matter and dark energy proposed by Scherrer [51].

From Eq. (3.2) the energy density and the equation of state of radiation are given, respectively, by $\rho_r = 3b_1X_1^2$ and $w_r = 1/3$. The no-ghost condition (3.28) is satisfied for $b_1 > 0$. In Horndeski theories including Model (A), Eq. (3.36) shows that the sound speed square of radiation is given by

$$c_{s\rm H2}^2 = \frac{1}{3} \,. \tag{4.10}$$

In Model (B), the radiation sound speed square c_{s2}^2 deviates from $c_{s\rm H2}^2$ with the difference estimated by Eq. (3.44).

The energy density and the equation of state of non-relativistic matter following from Eq. (4.9) are given, respectively, by

$$\rho_m = b_2(X_2 - X_0)(3X_2 + X_0) \,, \qquad w_m = \frac{X_2 - X_0}{3X_2 + X_0} \,. \tag{4.11}$$

Provided that X_2 is close to X_0, the field ϕ_2 behaves as non-relativistic matter with $w_m \simeq 0$. Then, the no-ghost condition (3.28) is satisfied for $b_2 > 0$. From the continuity equation $\dot{\rho}_m + 3H(1+w_m)\rho_m = 0$, we obtain the dependence $\rho_m \propto a^{-3}$ for $\epsilon \equiv (X_2 - X_0)/X_0 \ll 1$ and hence $\epsilon \propto w_m \propto a^{-3}$. The matter energy density can be expressed as $\rho_m = 16b_2X_0^2w_m/(1-3w_m)^2$. In Horndeski theories, the sound speed square of non-relativistic matter reads

$$c_{s\rm H3}^2 = \frac{X_2 - X_0}{3X_2 - X_0} = \frac{2w_m}{1+3w_m} \,, \tag{4.12}$$

which is much smaller than 1 for $w_m \ll 1$. The matter sound speed square c_{s3}^2 in Model (B) is subject to change relative to $c_{s\rm H3}^2$ given above. The presence of an additional pressure affects the gravitational growth of matter perturbations. For the successful structure formation, we require that $c_{s3}^2 \ll 1$ during the matter-dominated epoch.

The background cosmology based on Eqs. (4.4) and (4.5) has been studied in detail in Refs. [49, 50]. In what follows we shall briefly review the background dynamics and then study how the two Galileon theories can be distinguished from each other at the level of perturbations. A de Sitter solution ($H = H_{\rm dS} =$ constant) responsible for the late-time cosmic acceleration can be realized for a constant field velocity $\dot{\chi}_{\rm dS}$. Normalizing the mass M as $M^3 = M_{\rm pl}H_{\rm dS}^2$ and defining the dimensionless variable $x_{\rm dS} \equiv \dot{\chi}_{\rm dS}/(H_{\rm dS}M_{\rm pl})$, the coefficients c_2 and c_3 are related with the quantities $\alpha \equiv c_4 x_{\rm dS}^4$ and $\beta \equiv c_5 x_{\rm dS}^5$, as

$$c_2 x_{\rm dS}^2 = 6 + 9\alpha - 12\beta\,, \qquad c_3 x_{\rm dS}^3 = 2 + 9\alpha - 9\beta\,. \tag{4.13}$$

We also introduce the following dimensionless variables:

$$r_1 \equiv \frac{\dot{\chi}_{\rm dS} H_{\rm dS}}{\dot{\chi} H}\,, \qquad r_2 \equiv \frac{H}{H_{\rm dS}}\left(\frac{\dot{\chi}}{\dot{\chi}_{\rm dS}}\right)^5\,, \tag{4.14}$$

which are normalized as $r_1 = r_2 = 1$ at the de Sitter fixed point. The Friedmann equation (4.4) can be written in the form

$$\Omega_m = 1 - \Omega_r - \Omega_{\rm DE}\,, \tag{4.15}$$

where $\Omega_m \equiv \rho_m/(3M_{\rm pl}^2H^2)$, $\Omega_r \equiv \rho_r/(3M_{\rm pl}^2H^2)$, and

$$\Omega_{\rm DE} \equiv \frac{\rho_{\rm DE}}{3M_{\rm pl}^2H^2} = -\frac{1}{2}(2 + 3\alpha - 4\beta)r_1^3 r_2 + (2 + 9\alpha - 9\beta)r_1^2 r_2 - \frac{15}{2}\alpha r_1 r_2 + 7\beta r_2\,. \tag{4.16}$$

The autonomous equations of motion for the variables r_1, r_2, and Ω_r are presented in Appendix (see also Ref. [50] for detail). The variation of the Hubble parameter is known by $H'/H = -5r_1'/(4r_1) - r_2'/(4r_2)$, where a prime represents the derivative with respect to $\ln a$.

There exists a so-called tracker solution characterized by $r_1 = 1$, along which the field velocity evolves as $\dot{\chi} \propto H^{-1}$ [49, 50]. Along the tracker, the variable r_2 grows as $r_2' = 2r_2(3 - 3r_2 + \Omega_r)/(1 + r_2)$ from the regime $r_2 \ll 1$ to the de Sitter fixed point characterized by $r_2 = 1$ and $\Omega_r = 0$. The dark energy equation of state on the tracker is given by

$$w_{\rm DE} = -\frac{\Omega_r + 6}{3(1 + r_2)}\,, \tag{4.17}$$

which evolves as $w_{\rm DE} = -7/3 \to -2 \to -1$ during the cosmological sequence of radiation ($\Omega_r \simeq 1$, $r_2 \ll 1$), matter ($\Omega_r \ll 1$, $r_2 \ll 1$), and de Sitter ($\Omega_r \ll 1$, $r_2 = 1$) epochs. However, the tracker equation of state (4.17) is in tension with the joint data analysis of Sn Ia, CMB, and BAO because of the large deviation of $w_{\rm DE}$ from -1 during the matter era [52].

The solutions that approach the tracker at late times can be consistent with the observational data. In this case, the variable r_1 is much smaller than 1 during the early stage of the cosmological evolution. In the regime $r_1 \ll 1$, the variables r_1 and r_2 approximately obey the differential equations

$$r_1' \simeq \frac{9 + \Omega_r + 21\beta r_2}{8 + 21\beta r_2} r_1\,, \qquad r_2' \simeq \frac{3 + 11\Omega_r - 21\beta r_2}{8 + 21\beta r_2} r_2\,. \tag{4.18}$$

Provided that $|\beta r_2| \ll 1$, we obtain the solutions $r_1 \propto a^{5/4}$, $r_2 \propto a^{7/4}$ during the radiation era and $r_1 \propto a^{9/8}$, $r_2 \propto a^{3/8}$ during the matter era. When $r_1 \ll 1$, the dark energy equation of state is given by

$$w_{\rm DE} \simeq -\frac{1 + \Omega_r}{8 + 21\beta r_2}\,. \tag{4.19}$$

In the regime $|\beta r_2| \ll 1$, $w_{\rm DE}$ evolves from the value $-1/4$ (radiation era) to the value $-1/8$ (matter era). Once r_1 approaches 1, the solutions enter the tracking regime characterized by the equation of state (4.17). Provided that the approach to the tracker occurs at low redshifts, $w_{\rm DE}$ takes a minimum value larger than -1.3 and then it approaches the de Sitter value -1 in the asymptotic future. Such late-time tracking solutions are consistent with the combined data analysis of Sn Ia, CMB, and BAO [52].

B. No-ghost conditions

Let us discuss no-ghost conditions for tensor and scalar perturbations in Models (A) and (B). From Eq. (3.9) the tensor ghost is absent for $L_{\mathcal{S}} = -A_4 - 3HA_5 > 0$, whose condition is the same in both Models (A) and (B). This

property also holds for no-ghost conditions of the scalar mode, because Eq. (3.26) does not involve the functions B_4, B_5 and their derivatives. We recall that, for the matter fields characterized by the Lagrangians (4.8) and (4.9), the conditions (3.28) are satisfied for $b_1 > 0$ and $b_2 > 0$, respectively.

In the following, let us consider the case in which the sign of $\dot{\chi}$ does not change during the cosmic expansion history, i.e., $r_1 > 0$ and $r_2 > 0$. On using the variables r_1 and r_2, the no-ghost conditions (3.9) and (3.27) for tensor and scalar modes are given, respectively, by

$$L_{\mathcal{S}} = [2 + 3r_2(\alpha r_1 - 2\beta)]M_{\rm pl}^2/4 > 0\,, \tag{4.20}$$

$$\begin{aligned} g_2 &= 3M_{\rm pl}^4 H_{\rm dS}^2 \sqrt{r_2/r_1^5} \\ &\times \{(72\alpha^2 + 81\beta^2 - 150\alpha\beta + 30\alpha - 36\beta + 4)r_1^4 r_2 + [8\beta - 6\alpha - 4 - (162\alpha^2 + 24\beta^2 - 180\alpha\beta + 36\alpha - 12\beta)r_2]r_1^3 \\ &+ [36\alpha - 36\beta + 8 + (90\alpha^2 - 162\beta^2 + 162\alpha\beta + 36\beta)r_2]r_1^2 - 12\alpha(3 + 16\beta r_2)r_1 + 105\beta^2 r_2 + 40\beta\} > 0\,. \end{aligned} \tag{4.21}$$

In the regime $r_1 \ll 1$ and $r_2 \ll 1$ the condition (4.20) is satisfied, while another condition (4.21) translates to

$$\beta > 0\,. \tag{4.22}$$

In order to satisfy Eqs. (4.20) and (4.21) in the tracking regime ($r_1 = 1$ and $0 < r_2 \leq 1$), we require that

$$-2 < 3(\alpha - 2\beta) < 2\,. \tag{4.23}$$

The conditions (4.22) and (4.23) need to obey for avoiding tensor and scalar ghosts.

C. Tensor propagation speeds

Since $\mathcal{E} = B_4 + \dot{B}_5/2$ for the Lagrangian (2.8), the tensor propagation speed square $c_t^2 = \mathcal{E}/L_{\mathcal{S}}$ is different between the two Galileon theories. For Model (A) it is given by [49, 50]

$$c_t^2 = \frac{2r_1(2 - \alpha r_1 r_2) - 3\beta(r_1 r_2' + r_2 r_1')}{2r_1[2 + 3r_2(\alpha r_1 - 2\beta)]} \qquad \text{[Model (A)]}, \tag{4.24}$$

which is close to 1 for $r_2 \ll 1$. At the de Sitter fixed point we have $c_t^2 = (2 - \alpha)/(2 + 3\alpha - 6\beta)$, so we require $\alpha < 2$ to avoid the Laplacian instability of tensor perturbations under the condition (4.23). During the transition from the regime $r_1 = 1, r_2 \ll 1$ to the regime $r_1 = 1, r_2 = 1$, it happens that c_t^2 has a minimum. Imposing that $c_t^2 > 0$ at the minimum, it follows that $\alpha < 12\sqrt{\beta} - 9\beta - 2$ [49, 50].

For Model (B) we have $\mathcal{E} = M_{\rm pl}^2/2$, so the tensor propagation speed square is simply given by

$$c_t^2 = \frac{2}{2 + 3r_2(\alpha r_1 - 2\beta)} \qquad \text{[Model (B)]}\,. \tag{4.25}$$

Under the no-ghost condition (4.20), c_t^2 is positive. As long as the tensor perturbation is concerned, the viable parameter space of Model (B) is not restrictive compared to that of Model (A).

D. Scalar propagation speeds

1. Model (A)

The covariant Galileon model (A) belongs to a class of Horndeski theories, so the three scalar propagation speed squares c_s^2 follow from Eqs. (3.35)-(3.36) with $I = 2, 3$. Among them the sound speed squares c_{s2}^2 and c_{s3}^2 of radiation and non-relativistic matter are given, respectively, by Eqs. (4.10) and (4.12). On using the relation

$$\dot{\phi}_I^2 P_{X_I}^{(I)} = -\frac{1}{2}(\rho^{(I)} + P^{(I)}) = -\frac{3}{2}M_{\rm pl}^2 H^2(1 + w_{(I)})\Omega_{(I)}\,, \tag{4.26}$$

where $w_{(I)}$ and $\Omega_{(I)}$ are the equation of state and the density parameter of the field ϕ_I, the first propagation speed square c_{s1}^2 follows from Eq. (3.35), as

$$c_{s1}^2 = -\frac{\mathcal{W}^2 M_{\rm pl}^2}{4L_{\mathcal{S}} g_2}\left[\left(1 - \frac{H'}{H}\right)\tilde{C}_{3\rm H} + \tilde{C}_{3\rm H}' + \frac{4\mathcal{E}_{\rm H}}{M_{\rm pl}^2} + \frac{48L_{\mathcal{S}}^2 H^2}{\mathcal{W}^2}\left\{\Omega_r(1 + w_r) + \Omega_m(1 + w_m)\right\}\right]\,, \tag{4.27}$$

where $\tilde{C}_{3\rm H}=H\mathcal{C}_{3\rm H}/M_{\rm pl}^2$, $\mathcal{E}_{\rm H}=[2r_1(2-\alpha r_1 r_2)-3\beta(r_1 r_2'+r_2 r_1')]M_{\rm pl}^2/(8r_1)$, and

$$\mathcal{W}=M_{\rm pl}^2 H_{\rm dS}(r_1^5 r_2)^{-1/4}\left[2-21\beta r_2+15\alpha r_1 r_2-(2+9\alpha-9\beta)r_1^2 r_2\right]. \tag{4.28}$$

Note that the matter density parameter Ω_m can be eliminated by using the relation (4.15). The evolution of c_{s1}^2 in three asymptotic regimes is given by [49, 50]:

$$c_{s1}^2=\begin{cases}\dfrac{1}{40}(\Omega_r+1) & [\text{(i) } r_1\ll 1,\ r_2\ll 1],\\ \dfrac{8+10\alpha-9\beta+\Omega_r(2+3\alpha-3\beta)}{3(2-3\alpha+6\beta)} & [\text{(ii) } r_1=1,\ r_2\ll 1],\\ \dfrac{(\alpha-2\beta)(4+15\alpha^2-48\alpha\beta+36\beta^2)}{2(2+3\alpha-6\beta)(2-3\alpha+6\beta)} & [\text{(iii) } r_1=1,\ r_2=1].\end{cases} \tag{4.29}$$

In the regime (i) we have $c_{s1}^2=1/20$ and $1/40$ during the radiation and matter eras, respectively, so there is no Laplacian instability. If the solutions enter the tracking regime (ii) during the radiation era, we require the stability condition $10+13\alpha-12\beta>0$. Taking into account the condition (4.23), the de Sitter fixed point (iii) is stable for $\alpha>2\beta$. The theoretically viable parameter space is shown in figure 1 of Ref. [49]. The evolution of matter density perturbations and observational constraints on the covariant Galileon from large-scale structures have been studied in Refs. [53].

2. Model (B)

In the case of Model (B), we need to solve the coupled equation (3.30) for $N=3$, i.e.,

$$\left(c_s^2K_{11}-G_{11}\right)\left(c_s^2K_{22}-G_{22}\right)\left(c_s^2K_{33}-G_{33}\right)-\left(c_s^2K_{12}-G_{12}\right)^2\left(c_s^2K_{33}-G_{33}\right)-\left(c_s^2K_{13}-G_{13}\right)^2\left(c_s^2K_{22}-G_{22}\right)=0. \tag{4.30}$$

The solutions to this third-order equation for c_s^2 are given by

$$c_s^2=-\frac{a_2}{3a_1}+u_++u_-\,,\quad -\frac{a_2}{3a_1}+u_+\omega+u_-\omega^2\,,\quad -\frac{a_2}{3a_1}+u_+\omega^2+u_-\omega\,, \tag{4.31}$$

where $\omega=-(1+\sqrt{3}\,i)/2$, $u_\pm=[(-q\pm\sqrt{q^2+4p^3/27})/2]^{1/3}$, $p=a_3/a_1-a_2^2/(3a_1^2)$, $q=2a_2^3/(27a_1^3)-a_2a_3/(3a_1^2)+a_4/a_1$, and

$$a_1 = K_{11}K_{22}K_{33}-K_{12}^2K_{33}-K_{13}^2K_{22}\,, \tag{4.32}$$
$$a_2 = K_{12}^2G_{33}+K_{13}^2G_{22}-K_{11}K_{22}G_{33}-K_{11}G_{22}K_{33}-G_{11}K_{22}K_{33}+2K_{12}G_{12}K_{33}+2K_{13}G_{13}K_{22}\,, \tag{4.33}$$
$$a_3 = K_{11}G_{22}G_{33}+G_{11}K_{22}G_{33}+G_{11}G_{22}K_{33}-G_{12}^2K_{33}-G_{13}^2K_{22}-2K_{12}G_{12}G_{33}-2K_{13}G_{13}G_{22}\,, \tag{4.34}$$
$$a_4 = G_{12}^2G_{33}+G_{13}^2G_{22}-G_{11}G_{22}G_{33}\,. \tag{4.35}$$

When $q^2+4p^3/27<0$, all the solutions (4.31) are real.

One of the solutions c_{s1}^2 in Eq. (4.31) is associated with the propagation speed square of the dark energy field χ. In three asymptotic regimes it is given by

$$c_{s1}^2=\begin{cases}\dfrac{1}{40}(3\Omega_r-1) & [\text{(i) } r_1\ll 1,\ r_2\ll 1],\\ \dfrac{16-15(\alpha-2\beta)+\Omega_r(4-3\alpha+6\beta)}{6(2-3\alpha+6\beta)} & [\text{(ii) } r_1=1,\ r_2\ll 1],\\ \dfrac{\alpha-2\beta}{2+3\alpha-6\beta} & [\text{(iii) } r_1=1,\ r_2=1].\end{cases} \tag{4.36}$$

Under the no-ghost condition (4.23), the propagation speed square c_{s1}^2 in the regime (ii) is positive. The de Sitter fixed point (iii) is stable for

$$\alpha>2\beta\,. \tag{4.37}$$

In the regime (i) we have $c_{s1}^2=1/20$ for $\Omega_r=1$, but $c_{s1}^2=-1/40$ for $\Omega_r=0$. This means that the perturbations are plagued by short-scale Laplacian instabilities during the matter era for late-time tracking solutions. As long as



FIG. 1: Evolution of the scalar propagation speed squares $c_{s1}^2, c_{s2}^2, c_{s3}^2$ and the dark energy equation of state $w_{\rm DE}$ versus the redshift $z = 1/a - 1$ in Model (B). We choose the model parameters $\alpha = 0.3$ and $\beta = 0.14$ with the initial conditions $r_1 = 5 \times 10^{-11}$, $r_2 = 8 \times 10^{-12}$, $\Omega_r = 0.999995$, and $w_m = 10^{-3}$ at $z = 6.0 \times 10^8$. This case corresponds to the late-time tracking solution that approaches the tracker ($r_1 = 1$) at low redshifts. During most of the radiation and matter eras the solution is in the regime $r_1 \ll 1$ and $r_2 \ll 1$, in which case the first propagation speed square is given by $c_{s1}^2 \simeq (3\Omega_r - 1)/40$.

the solutions approach the tracker by the end of the radiation era, it is possible to avoid the Laplacian instability of scalar perturbations. We recall however that only the background trajectories approaching the tracker around the end of the matter era are consistent with the joint data analysis of Sn Ia, CMB, and BAO [52]. Then the solutions need to be in the regime (i) during most of the matter era, in which case the Laplacian instability cannot be avoided.

In the regime (i), the quantity $c_{s\rm H1}$ defined by Eq. (3.35) evolves as

$$c_{s\rm H1}^2 = \frac{1}{40}\left(7\Omega_r + 11\right), \tag{4.38}$$

which is positive. The difference between (4.38) and $c_s^2 = (3\Omega_r - 1)/40$ in Eq. (4.36) should be induced from the term $\delta\mathcal{C}_3$ in Eq. (3.39). This term can be expressed as

$$\delta\mathcal{C}_3 = -\frac{3r_2(\alpha r_1 - 2\beta)}{2 + 3r_2(\alpha r_1 - 2\beta)}, \tag{4.39}$$

which means that $|\delta\mathcal{C}_3| \ll 1$ in the regimes (i) and (ii). For radiation, the quantity ξ_1 defined by Eq. (3.43) evolves as $\xi_1 = -2/(15\beta r_2)$ in the regime (i) and hence $|\xi_1| \gg 1$. From Eq. (3.42) we then have $\delta c_{s1}^2 = -2/5$ during the radiation era, so that $c_{s1}^2 = c_{s\rm H1}^2 + \delta c_{s1}^2 = 1/20$. For non-relativistic matter, the evolution of the quantity ξ_2 is given by $\xi_2 = -1/(10\beta r_2)$ and hence $\delta c_{s1}^2 = -3/10$ during the regime (i) of the matter era. Hence we obtain the negative propagation speed square $c_{s1}^2 = c_{s\rm H1}^2 + \delta c_{s1}^2 = -1/40$. Interestingly, even if the difference between $\mathcal{C}_3$ and $\mathcal{C}_{3\rm H}$ is small in the regime (i), the modification to $c_{s\rm H1}^2$ cannot be negligible. From Eq. (3.44) the corrections δc_{sI}^2 ($I = 2, 3$) to $c_{s\rm H2}^2$ and $c_{s\rm H3}^2$ of radiation and non-relativistic matter are suppressed relative to δc_{s1}^2 by the additional factor $\delta\mathcal{C}_3$, so the deviations of c_{s2}^2 and c_{s3}^2 from the values (4.10) and (4.12) are very small in the regime (i).

Evaluating the term ξ_2 for non-relativistic matter along the tracker ($r_1 = 1$), the correction δc_{s1}^2 to $c_{s\rm H1}^2$ after the onset of the matter-dominated epoch is given by

$$\delta c_{s1}^2 \simeq \frac{3(\alpha - 2\beta)(1 - r_2)}{(2 - 3\alpha + 6\beta)(1 + r_2)}. \tag{4.40}$$

In the regime (ii) we have $\delta c_{s1}^2 \simeq 3(\alpha - 2\beta)/(2 - 3\alpha + 6\beta)$, while δc_{s1}^2 vanishes at the de Sitter point (iii). From Eq. (3.44) the correction δc_{s3}^2 to the matter sound speed square $c_{s\rm H3}^2$ ($= O(w_m) \ll 1$) on the tracker can be estimated

as

$$\delta c_{s3}^2 \simeq \frac{c_{s\rm H3}^2}{c_{s\rm H3}^2 - c_{s\rm H1}^2 - \delta c_{s1}^2} \frac{9(\alpha-2\beta)^2 r_2 \Omega_m}{2[2+3r_2(\alpha-2\beta)](1+r_2)(2-3\alpha+6\beta)}\,, \tag{4.41}$$

which is suppressed both in the regimes (ii) and (iii). The correction δc_{s3}^2 can provide some contribution to $c_{s\rm H3}^2$ around $r_2 = O(0.1)$, but δc_{s3}^2 is still much smaller than 1 due to the multiplication of the small term $c_{s\rm H3}^2$ in Eq. (4.41).

In Fig. 1 we plot the evolution of the scalar propagation speed squares c_{s1}^2, c_{s2}^2, and c_{s3}^3 for the initial conditions $r_1 \ll 1$ and $r_2 \ll 1$ in the deep radiation-dominated epoch. In this case, the dark energy equation of state $w_{\rm DE}$ starts to evolve from $-1/4$ (radiation era) to $-1/8$ (matter era) and then it reaches a minimum -1.1 around the redshift $z = 0.3$. This late-time tracking behavior is consistent with the observational data of Sn Ia, CMB, and BAO at the background level [52].

From Fig. 1 we find that the first propagation speed square c_{s1}^2 evolves from the value $1/20$ in the radiation era, which is followed by the decrease to the value close to $-1/40$ in the matter era. The solution stays in the regime (i) during most of the matter-dominated epoch. The period during which the solution is in the regime (ii) is short, so c_{s1}^2 soon approaches the value 9.7×10^{-3} at the de Sitter fixed point (iii) after its temporal variation around $z \lesssim O(1)$. Figure 1 shows that the sound speed squares c_{s2}^2 and c_{s3}^3 of radiation and non-relativistic matter are close to the values $1/3$ and 0, respectively. This result is consistent with the analytic estimation given above. For the parameters used in the numerical simulations of Fig. 1, we find that the deviation of c_{s2}^2 from the value $1/3$ is less than the order of 10^{-4} in the matter era.

V. CONCLUSIONS

We have studied the cosmology of the recently proposed generalized Horndeski theories on the flat FLRW background. The Lagrangian of these theories is simply expressed in terms of three-dimensional scalar quantities constructed in the 3+1 ADM decomposition of space-time. In Horndeski theories there are particular relations (2.11) between the coefficients A_i and B_i, but GLPV theories are not subject to this restriction. On the isotropic cosmological background, the perturbation equations of motion in GLPV theories are of second order with one scalar degree of freedom.

In the presence of multiple scalar fields ϕ_I ($I = 1, 2, \cdots, N-1$) described by the Lagrangians $P^{(I)}(X_I)$, we have expanded the action (3.1) up to quadratic order in perturbations of the ADM scalar quantities. We have in mind the application to dark energy with additional perfect fluids of radiation and non-relativistic matter. The second-order action for tensor perturbations is given by Eq. (3.7) with the propagation speed square $c_t^2 = \mathcal{E}/L_{\mathcal{S}}$, so the tensor ghosts and Laplacian instabilities are absent for $L_{\mathcal{S}} > 0$ and $\mathcal{E} > 0$. We have derived the second-order Lagrangian density for scalar perturbations of the form (3.20), which explicitly shows the absence of derivatives higher than second order.

The positivity of the $N \times N$ matrix $\boldsymbol{K}$ implies that the scalar ghosts do not appear under the conditions (3.26). The scalar propagation speeds c_s obey the algebraic equation (3.30). In Horndeski theories this equation can be written as the separate form (3.34), so the solutions to c_s^2 are simply given by Eqs. (3.35)-(3.36). In GLPV theories the propagation speed squares are coupled each other in the form (3.37), whose right hand side vanishes in the Horndeski limit. Under the condition that the deviation of the term $\mathcal{C}_3$ from the Horndeski value $-16L_{\mathcal{S}}^2/\mathcal{W}$ is small, we have estimated the propagation speeds in Eqs. (3.40)-(3.44). Compared to the modification δc_{s1}^2 to the first sound speed square $c_{s\rm H1}^2$ associated with the dark energy field χ, the corrections δc_{sI}^2 ($I = 2, 3, \cdots, N$) to the matter sound speed squares $c_{s\rm HI}^2$ are generally suppressed.

We have applied our results in Sec. III to the cosmology based on the covariantized Galileon (a class of GLPV theories) and the covariant Galileon (a class of Horndeski theories) in the presence of perfect fluids of radiation and non-relativistic matter. These two theories give rise to the background equations of motion exactly the same as each other, so we cannot distinguish them at the background level.

At the level of perturbations, however, different choices of the functions B_4, B_5 give rise to different values of $\mathcal{E}$, $\mathcal{C}_3$ defined respectively by Eqs. (3.8) and (3.25). As a consequence, the first scalar propagation speed squares $c_{s\rm H1}^2$ in Eq. (3.35) differ in these two theories. Moreover, in GLPV theories, there is a correction term δc_{s1}^2 to $c_{s\rm H1}^2$ estimated approximately by Eq. (3.42). Indeed the first scalar propagation speed square c_{s1}^2 in the covariantized Galileon becomes negative ($-1/40$) in the deep matter era for late-time tracking solutions, while in the covariant Galileon $c_{s1}^2 = c_{s\rm H1}^2 = 1/40$. Hence the former is plagued by the small-scale instability problem of dark energy perturbations, while the latter has a theoretical consistent parameter space. The matter sound speed squares of radiation and non-relativistic matter for the covariantized Galileon are close to the values (3.36) in the Horndeski limit.

We have thus provided a general scheme for studying the evolution of background and perturbations in dark energy models based on GLPV theories. These results will be useful in both placing model-independent constraints on the properties of dark energy/modified gravity and in imposing bounds on individual models. For the latter, it may be

of interest to search for theoretically and observationally allowed parameter spaces in the covariantized version of the extended Galileon scenario advocated in Refs. [43, 54].

Acknowledgements

This work is supported by the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research from JSPS (Nos. 24·6770 (RK), 24540286 (ST)) and by the cooperation programs of Tokyo University of Science and CSIC. We thank Antonio De Felice, László Á. Gergely, and Shinji Mukohyama for useful discussions.

Appendix A: The autonomous equations in two Galileon theories

In both Models (A) and (B) described by the functions (4.2) and (4.3), the variables r_1, r_2, and Ω_r obey the following equations of motion

$$\begin{aligned}
r_1' &= \frac{1}{\Delta}(r_1-1)\,r_1\left[r_1\left(r_1(-3\alpha+4\beta-2)+6\alpha-5\beta\right)-5\beta\right] \\
&\quad\times\left[2\left(\Omega_r+9\right)+3r_2\left(r_1^3(-3\alpha+4\beta-2)+2r_1^2(9\alpha-9\beta+2)-15r_1\alpha+14\beta\right)\right], \qquad \text{(A1)}\\
r_2' &= -\frac{1}{\Delta}[r_2(6r_1^2(r_2(45\alpha^2-4(9\alpha+2)\beta+36\beta^2)-(\Omega_r-7)(9\alpha-9\beta+2))+r_1^3(-2(\Omega_r+33)(3\alpha-4\beta+2) \\
&\quad -3r_2(-2(201\alpha+89)\beta+15\alpha(9\alpha+2)+356\beta^2))-3r_1\alpha(-28\Omega_r+123r_2\beta+36)+10\beta(-11\Omega_r+21r_2\beta-3) \\
&\quad +3r_1^4r_2(9\alpha^2-30\alpha(4\beta+1)+2(2-9\beta)^2)+3r_1^6r_2(3\alpha-4\beta+2)^2+3r_1^5r_2(9\alpha-9\beta+2)(3\alpha-4\beta+2))], \qquad \text{(A2)}\\
\Omega_r' &= \frac{2}{\Delta}\Omega_r[r_1^2(4(\Omega_r-1)(9\alpha-9\beta+2)+6r_2(-15\alpha^2+36\alpha\beta+4(2-9\beta)\beta))-2r_1^3((\Omega_r-1)(3\alpha-4\beta+2) \\
&\quad +9r_2(18(\alpha+1)\beta+\alpha(9\alpha+2)-36\beta^2))+12r_1\alpha(-3\Omega_r+22r_2\beta+3)-10\beta(-4\Omega_r+21r_2\beta+4) \\
&\quad +r_1^4r_2(549\alpha^2+\alpha(330-840\beta)+2(2-9\beta)^2)+3r_1^6r_2(3\alpha-4\beta+2)^2-12r_1^5r_2(9\alpha-9\beta+2)(3\alpha-4\beta+2)], \\
&\qquad \text{(A3)}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta &\equiv 2r_1^4r_2[72\alpha^2+30\alpha(1-5\beta)+(2-9\beta)^2]+4r_1^2[9r_2(5\alpha^2+9\alpha\beta+(2-9\beta)\beta)+2(9\alpha-9\beta+2)] \\
&\quad +4r_1^3[-3r_2\left(-2(15\alpha+1)\beta+3\alpha(9\alpha+2)+4\beta^2\right)-3\alpha+4\beta-2]-24r_1\alpha(16r_2\beta+3)+10\beta(21r_2\beta+8). \qquad \text{(A4)}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that we have used the Maple software for deriving these autonomous equations and the Fortran software for solving them numerically.

[1] A. G. Riess *et al.* [Supernova Search Team Collaboration], Astron. J. **116**, 1009 (1998) [astro-ph/9805201].
[2] S. Perlmutter *et al.* [Supernova Cosmology Project Collaboration], Astrophys. J. **517**, 565 (1999) [astro-ph/9812133].
[3] S. Weinberg, Rev. Mod. Phys. **61**, 1 (1989).
[4] E. J. Copeland, M. Sami and S. Tsujikawa, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **15**, 1753 (2006) [hep-th/0603057]; S. Tsujikawa, arXiv:1004.1493 [astro-ph.CO]; T. Clifton, P. G. Ferreira, A. Padilla and C. Skordis, Phys. Rept. **513**, 1 (2012) [arXiv:1106.2476 [astro-ph.CO]].
[5] G. Hinshaw *et al.* [WMAP Collaboration], Astrophys. J. Suppl. **208**, 19 (2013) [arXiv:1212.5226 [astro-ph.CO]].
[6] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], arXiv:1303.5076 [astro-ph.CO].
[7] Y. Fujii, Phys. Rev. D **26**, 2580 (1982); L. H. Ford, Phys. Rev. D **35**, 2339 (1987); C. Wetterich, Nucl. Phys. B **302**, 668 (1988); T. Chiba, N. Sugiyama and T. Nakamura, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **289**, L5 (1997) [astro-ph/9704199]; P. G. Ferreira and M. Joyce, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 4740 (1997) [astro-ph/9707286]; R. R. Caldwell, R. Dave and P. J. Steinhardt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 1582 (1998) [astro-ph/9708069].
[8] C. Armendariz-Picon, T. Damour and V. F. Mukhanov, Phys. Lett. B **458**, 209 (1999) [hep-th/9904075]; T. Chiba, T. Okabe and M. Yamaguchi, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 023511 (2000) [astro-ph/9912463]; C. Armendariz-Picon, V. F. Mukhanov and P. J. Steinhardt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 4438 (2000) [astro-ph/0004134].
[9] S. Capozziello, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **11**, 483 (2002) [gr-qc/0201033]; S. Capozziello, S. Carloni and A. Troisi, Recent Res. Dev. Astron. Astrophys. **1**, 625 (2003) [astro-ph/0303041]; S. M. Carroll, V. Duvvuri, M. Trodden and M. S. Turner, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 043528 (2004) [astro-ph/0306438].

[10] W. Hu and I. Sawicki, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 064004 (2007) [arXiv:0705.1158 [astro-ph]]; S. A. Appleby and R. A. Battye, Phys. Lett. B **654**, 7 (2007) [arXiv:0705.3199 [astro-ph]]; A. A. Starobinsky, JETP Lett. **86**, 157 (2007) [arXiv:0706.2041 [astro-ph]]; S. Tsujikawa, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 023507 (2008) [arXiv:0709.1391 [astro-ph]].

[11] L. Amendola, D. Polarski and S. Tsujikawa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 131302 (2007) [astro-ph/0603703]; A. De Felice and S. Tsujikawa, Living Rev. Rel. **13**, 3 (2010) [arXiv:1002.4928 [gr-qc]].

[12] M. Ostrogradski, Mem. Ac. St. Petersbourg VI 4, 385 (1850).

[13] G. W. Horndeski, Int. J. Theor. Phys. 10, 363-384 (1974).

[14] C. Brans and R. H. Dicke, Phys. Rev. **124**, 925 (1961).

[15] A. Nicolis, R. Rattazzi and E. Trincherini, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 064036 (2009) [arXiv:0811.2197 [hep-th]].

[16] C. Deffayet, G. Esposito-Farese and A. Vikman, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 084003 (2009) [arXiv:0901.1314 [hep-th]]; C. Deffayet, S. Deser and G. Esposito-Farese, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 064015 (2009) [arXiv:0906.1967 [gr-qc]].

[17] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 043514 (2005) [hep-th/0506236].

[18] P. Creminelli, M. A. Luty, A. Nicolis and L. Senatore, JHEP **0612**, 080 (2006) [hep-th/0606090].

[19] C. Cheung, P. Creminelli, A. L. Fitzpatrick, J. Kaplan and L. Senatore, JHEP **0803**, 014 (2008) [arXiv:0709.0293 [hep-th]].

[20] P. Creminelli, G. D'Amico, J. Norena and F. Vernizzi, JCAP **0902**, 018 (2009) [arXiv:0811.0827 [astro-ph]].

[21] M. Park, K. M. Zurek and S. Watson, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 124008 (2010) [arXiv:1003.1722 [hep-th]].

[22] J. K. Bloomfield and E. E. Flanagan, JCAP **1210**, 039 (2012) [arXiv:1112.0303 [gr-qc]].

[23] R. A. Battye and J. A. Pearson, JCAP **1207**, 019 (2012) [arXiv:1203.0398 [hep-th]].

[24] E. M. Mueller, R. Bean and S. Watson, Phys. Rev. D **87**, 083504 (2013) [arXiv:1209.2706 [astro-ph.CO]].

[25] G. Gubitosi, F. Piazza and F. Vernizzi, JCAP **1302** (2013) 032 [arXiv:1210.0201 [hep-th]].

[26] J. K. Bloomfield, E. Flanagan, M. Park and S. Watson, JCAP **1308**, 010 (2013) [arXiv:1211.7054 [astro-ph.CO]].

[27] J. Bloomfield, JCAP **1312**, 044 (2013) [arXiv:1304.6712 [astro-ph.CO]].

[28] J. Gleyzes, D. Langlois, F. Piazza, and F. Vernizzi, JCAP **1308**, 025 (2013) [arXiv:1304.4840 [hep-th]].

[29] F. Piazza and F. Vernizzi, Class. Quant. Grav. **30**, 214007 (2013) [arXiv:1307.4350].

[30] N. Frusciante, M. Raveri and A. Silvestri, JCAP **1402**, 026 (2014) [arXiv:1310.6026 [astro-ph.CO]].

[31] B. Hu, M. Raveri, N. Frusciante and A. Silvestri, Phys. Rev. D **89**, 103530 (2014) [arXiv:1312.5742 [astro-ph.CO]].

[32] F. Piazza, H. Steigerwald and C. Marinoni, arXiv:1312.6111 [astro-ph.CO].

[33] L. Gergely and S. Tsujikawa, Phys. Rev. D **89**, 064059 (2014) [arXiv:1402.0553 [hep-th]].

[34] S. Tsujikawa, arXiv:1404.2684 [gr-qc].

[35] J. Gleyzes, D. Langlois, F. Piazza and F. Vernizzi, arXiv:1404.6495 [hep-th].

[36] M. Raveri, B. Hu, N. Frusciante and A. Silvestri, arXiv:1405.1022 [astro-ph.CO].

[37] X. Gao, arXiv:1406.0822 [gr-qc].

[38] R. L. Arnowitt, S. Deser and C. W. Misner, Phys. Rev. **117**, 1595 (1960).

[39] C. Deffayet, X. Gao, D. A. Steer and G. Zahariade, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 064039 (2011) [arXiv:1103.3260 [hep-th]].

[40] C. Charmousis, E. J. Copeland, A. Padilla and P. M. Saffin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 051101 (2012) [arXiv:1106.2000 [hep-th]].

[41] T. Kobayashi, M. Yamaguchi and J. 'i. Yokoyama, Prog. Theor. Phys. **126**, 511 (2011) [arXiv:1105.5723 [hep-th]].

[42] R. Kase, L. A. Gergely and S. Tsujikawa, arXiv:1406.2402 [hep-th].

[43] A. De Felice and S. Tsujikawa, JCAP **1202**, 007 (2012) [arXiv:1110.3878 [gr-qc]].

[44] D. Giannakis and W. Hu, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 063502 (2005) [astro-ph/0501423].

[45] A. De Felice, S. Mukohyama and S. Tsujikawa, Phys. Rev. D **82**, 023524 (2010) [arXiv:1006.0281 [astro-ph.CO]].

[46] A. De Felice, T. Kobayashi, and S. Tsujikawa, Phys. Lett. B **706**, 123 (2011) [arXiv:1108.4242 [gr-qc]].

[47] J. M. Maldacena, JHEP **0305**, 013 (2003) [astro-ph/0210603].

[48] J. Garriga and V. F. Mukhanov, Phys. Lett. B **458**, 219 (1999) [hep-th/9904176].

[49] A. De Felice and S. Tsujikawa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 111301 (2010) [arXiv:1007.2700 [astro-ph.CO]].

[50] A. De Felice and S. Tsujikawa, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 124029 (2011) [arXiv:1008.4236 [hep-th]].

[51] R. J. Scherrer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 011301 (2004) [astro-ph/0402316].

[52] S. Nesseris, A. De Felice and S. Tsujikawa, Phys. Rev. D **82**, 124054 (2010) [arXiv:1010.0407 [astro-ph.CO]].

[53] A. De Felice, R. Kase and S. Tsujikawa, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 043515 (2011) [arXiv:1011.6132 [astro-ph.CO]]; S. A. Appleby and E. V. Linder, JCAP **1208**, 026 (2012) [arXiv:1204.4314 [astro-ph.CO]]; A. Barreira, B. Li, C. M. Baugh and S. Pascoli, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 124016 (2012) [arXiv:1208.0600 [astro-ph.CO]]; H. Okada, T. Totani and S. Tsujikawa, Phys. Rev. D **87**, 103002 (2013) [arXiv:1208.4681 [astro-ph.CO]]; N. Bartolo, E. Bellini, D. Bertacca and S. Matarrese, JCAP **1303**, 034 (2013) [arXiv:1301.4831 [astro-ph.CO]]; J. Neveu *et al.*, Astron. Astrophys. **555**, A53 (2013) [arXiv:1302.2786 [gr-qc]]; A. Barreira, B. Li, A. Sanchez, C. M. Baugh and S. Pascoli, Phys. Rev. D **87**, no. 10, 103511 (2013) [arXiv:1302.6241 [astro-ph.CO]]; A. Barreira, B. Li, C. Baugh and S. Pascoli, arXiv:1406.0485 [astro-ph.CO].

[54] A. De Felice and S. Tsujikawa, JCAP **1203**, 025 (2012) [arXiv:1112.1774 [astro-ph.CO]].